

REMARKS

A review of the claims indicates that:

A) Claims 2, 5—8, 11, 12, 14, 16, 19, 21 and 23 remain in their original form.

B) Claims 1, 3, 9, 10, 13, 15, 17, 18, 20, 22, 24 and 25 are currently amended.

C) Claim 4 is currently cancelled.

In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejected claims and withdrawal of the rejections.

Claim Objections

Claims 3, 9, 10, 18 and 20 were objected to for using “comprising” instead of “consisting” in a Markush claim. The Applicant has made the correction.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

Claims 1—7, 10—15, 17, 19, 20, 22, 24 and 25 were rejected under §102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,879,342, hereinafter “Miller.” In response, the Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 recites a processor-readable medium comprising processor-executable instructions configured for:

- scrolling a number of images across a display screen of a digital camera;
- **locking an image in place on the display screen;** and
- **scrolling images behind the locked image.**

Claim 1 has been amended to recite the limitations of original Claim 4. Accordingly, Claim 1 is of equal scope to original Claim 4. Both original Claims

1 1 and 4 were rejected under Section 102(e) as being anticipated by Miller.
2 Accordingly, the Applicant will address the Section 102 rejection of Claim 4 when
3 addressing the rejection of Claim 1.

4 Claim 1 recites, "locking an image in place on the display screen" and
5 "scrolling images behind the locked image". Thus, Claim 1 recites instructions for
6 holding one image in place while other images are scrolled. This allows a selected
7 (locked) image to be compared to images that scroll into the user's view. The
8 Applicant respectfully submits that the prior art of record does not show or
9 disclose these elements.

10 Referring to FIG. 5 of the Miller reference, Miller discloses that a
11 "thermometer-like" tool 28b is divided into a region 30b that represents a quantity
12 of exposed images (e.g. memory devoted to actual images) and a region 34b of
13 available space for more images. An indicator 36b "slides" to an appropriate
14 location within the region 30b of exposed images to indicate, by location, a
15 particular image 42 from among the exposed images. The image 42 is "higher
16 resolution" because it is of larger size than a plurality of smaller "thumbnail" sized
17 images 38b that are arrayed below the larger image 42. Of the smaller images 38b
18 (i.e. the "thumbnail images") the center image 35b is a smaller version of the
19 larger image 42. The center image 35b is flanked by two prior and two subsequent
20 (thumbnail) images 38b. The buttons 24, 26 (see FIGs. 2 and 3) control the
21 display of the thumbnail images. Operation of the buttons 24, 26 causes
22 thumbnail images to scroll into, and out of, view. Thus, the thumbnail images
23 move in a direction dependent on the button operated, and the center thumbnail
24
25

1 image is duplicated in larger size at 42. (See generally Miller at column 6, lines
2 34—65 and other locations.)

3 Thus, the Applicant submits that Miller fails to disclose “locking an image”
4 while other images are scrolled. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that
5 Miller fails to disclose elements recited by the claim, and contends that Miller is
6 therefore deficient to support the rejection. Accordingly, the Applicant
7 respectfully asks that the Section 102 rejection is properly removed.

8 In making out the rejection of Claim 4, now incorporated into Claim 1,
9 Patent Office suggests that Miller discloses “stopping” an image. In essence, the
10 Patent Office suggested that the display of the images on Miller’s screen 14 is
11 stationary or fixed when the buttons 24, 26 are not in operation. Further, the
12 Patent Office suggests that the fixed images are “locked”. And still further, the
13 Patent Office suggests that images scroll when the buttons 24, 26 are pushed.

14 The Applicant respectfully disagrees that this characterization of Miller
15 actually discloses the elements recited by original Claim 4, now Claim 1. Claim 1
16 recites locking an image in place and scrolling other images. Miller does not
17 disclose any configuration wherein one image is locked (i.e. held in place) and
18 other images are scrolled. This is a difference between the recited claim language
19 and the Miller disclosure, and has functional ramifications. The instructions
20 recited by Claim 1 envision that a first image could be locked, and other images
21 scrolled to allow comparison of each scrolled image to the locked image.
22 Accordingly, Claim 1 (as amended to the scope of original Claim 4) recites
23 instructions having functionality not disclosed by Miller.
24
25

1 In view of the above remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests removal
2 of the Section 102 rejection of Claim 1, and requests allowance of that claim.

3 **Claims 2, 3 and 5—12** depend from Claim 1 and are allowable due to their
4 dependence from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for
5 their own recited features that, in combination with those recited in Claim 1, are
6 neither disclosed nor suggested in references of record, either singly or in
7 combination with one another. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests
8 that the Section 102 rejection of these claims be removed.

9
10 **Claim 13** recites a method comprising:

- 11 • capturing images with a digital camera;
- 12 • storing the images in a memory of the digital camera;
- 13 • displaying the images as a scrolling slideshow on a display screen of
14 the digital camera;
- 15 • **locking an image in place**; and
- 16 • **scrolling other images**.

17 Claim 13 has been amended to recite some of the limitations of original
18 Claim 15. Both original Claims 13 and 15 were rejected under Section 102(e) as
19 being anticipated by Miller. Accordingly, the Applicant will address the Section
20 102 rejection of Claim 15 when addressing the rejection of Claim 13.

21 Claim 13 recites, “locking an image in place” and “scrolling other images”.
22 Thus, Claim 13 recites instructions for holding one image in place while other
23 images are scrolled. This allows a selected (locked) image to be compared to
24 images that scroll into the user’s view. The Applicant respectfully submits that the
25 prior art of record does not show or disclose these elements.

1 In particular, the Applicant incorporates the remarks made above with
2 respect to Claims 1 and 4 at this location.

3 The Patent Office suggested that Claim 15 was allowable for reasons
4 associated with Claims 4 and 5. However, the remarks incorporated above show
5 that Miller fails to disclose "locking an image in place" and "scrolling other
6 images." Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Section 102
7 rejection of Claim 13 be removed.

8 **Claims 14—16** depend from Claim 13 and are allowable due to their
9 dependence from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for
10 their own recited features that, in combination with those recited in Claim 13, are
11 neither disclosed nor suggested in references of record, either singly or in
12 combination with one another. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests
13 that the Section 102 rejection of these claims be removed.

14
15 **Claim 17** recites a digital camera comprising:

- 16 • a display screen;
- 17 • captured images; and
- 18 • a scrolling slideshow module configured to scroll the captured
19 images across the display screen, thereby performing a scrolling
20 slideshow, and configured to **lock one of the captured images in
21 place during the scrolling slideshow.**

22 Claim 17 has been amended in a manner similar to Claim 1, which
23 incorporated elements recited by original Claim 4. Accordingly, the Applicant
24 incorporates by reference the comments made with respect to all earlier-discussed
25 claims.

1 The Patent Office suggests that Claim 17 is anticipated by Miller.
2 However, the Applicant submits that the Miller reference is deficient to support a
3 Section 102 rejection in view of the amendments, in view of the remarks
4 associated with the above claims. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully
5 requests that the Patent Office remove the Section 102 rejection and allow Claim
6 17, as amended, to issue.

7 **Claims 18—21** depend from Claim 17 and are allowable due to their
8 dependence from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for
9 their own recited features that, in combination with those recited in Claim 17, are
10 neither disclosed nor suggested in references of record, either singly or in
11 combination with one another. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests
12 that the Section 102 rejection of these claims be removed.

13
14 **Claim 22** recites a digital camera comprising:

- 15 • means for capturing light on an electronic light sensor;
- 16 • means for converting the light into digital data representing a
17 plurality of images;
- 18 • means for scrolling the images across a display screen as a scrolling
19 slideshow; and
- 20 • **means for locking an image in place on the display screen during
21 the scrolling slideshow.**

22 Claim 22 has been amended in a manner similar to Claim 1, which
23 incorporated elements recited by original Claim 4. The amendment recites a
24 locked image and a scrolling slideshow of other images. Accordingly, the
25 Applicant incorporates by reference the comments made with respect to all earlier-
discussed claims.

1 The Patent Office suggests that Claim 22 is anticipated by Miller, and
2 referred the Applicant to the rejections of other claims. However, the Applicant
3 submits that the Miller reference is deficient to support a Section 102 rejection in
4 view of the amendments, and in view of the remarks associated with the above
5 claims. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Patent Office
6 remove the Section 102 rejection and allow Claim 22, as amended, to issue.

7 **Claims 23—25** depend from Claim 22 and are allowable due to their
8 dependence from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for
9 their own recited features that, in combination with those recited in Claim 22, are
10 neither disclosed nor suggested in references of record, either singly or in
11 combination with one another. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests
12 that the Section 102 rejection of these claims be removed.

13 **Conclusion**

14 The Applicant submits that all of the claims are in condition for allowance
15 and respectfully requests that a Notice of Allowability be issued. If the Office's
16 next anticipated action is not the issuance of a Notice of Allowability, the
17 Applicant respectfully requests that the undersigned attorney be contacted for the
18 purpose of scheduling an interview.

19
20 Respectfully Submitted,

21
22 Dated: 9-19-07

23
24 By: 
25

David S. Thompson
Reg. No. 37,954
Attorney for Applicant

LEE & HAYES, PLLC
Suite 500
421 W. Riverside Avenue
Spokane, Washington 99201

Telephone: 509-324-9256 x235
Facsimile: (509) 323-8979